

Revised 3/16/05

***2004-2005 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools
Program***

U.S. Department of Education

Cover Sheet

Type of School: ☒ Elementary ☐ Middle ☐ High ☐ K-12

Name of Principal Mr. Joel Garcia

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Charles H. Mims Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 2 Mile Line Rd.

(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Mission

Texas

78572-4399

City

State

Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

County Hidalgo

School Code Number*#108908110

Telephone (956) 580-5645

Fax (956) 580-5892

Website/URL http://www.mission-cons.k12.tx.us/ E-mail jgarci31@mcisd.org

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

Date _____

(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent* Mrs. Elizabeth Garza

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Mission Consolidated Independent School District Tel. (956) 580-5500

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

Date _____

(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board

President/Chairperson Mr. J.D. Villarreal

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this package, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

Date _____

(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

**Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has not been in school improvement status or been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2004-2005 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.
4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 1999 and has not received the 2003 or 2004 *No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools Award*.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
6. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if the OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
7. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school, or the school district as a whole, has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district:

13	Elementary schools
0	Middle schools
3	Junior high schools
2	High schools
0	Other
<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 40px; display: inline-block; margin-right: 10px; text-align: center;">18</div> TOTAL	

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: \$ 8,480
 Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: \$ 7,708

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:
 - ☐ Urban or large central city
 - ☐ Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
 - ☐ Suburban
 - ☒ Small city or town in a rural area
 - ☐ Rural

4. 1 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
4 If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?

5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total		Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	24	23	47		7			
K	57	36	93		8			
1	50	47	97		9			
2	50	49	99		10			
3	38	52	90		11			
4	54	39	93		12			
5	43	49	92		Other			
6	44	53	97					
				TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →				708

[Throughout the document, round numbers to avoid decimals.]

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- | |
|---|
| <u>6</u> % White |
| <u>0</u> % Black or African American |
| <u>94</u> % Hispanic or Latino |
| <u>0</u> % Asian/Pacific Islander |
| <u>0</u> % American Indian/Alaskan Native |
| 100% Total |

Use only the five standard categories in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of the school.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 15%

(This rate should be calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.)

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	10
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	7
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	17
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	304
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.055921
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	6%

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 19%
134 Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented: 1
Specify languages: Spanish

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 53 %

Total number students who qualify: 378

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families or the school does not participate in the federally-supported lunch program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services: 8 %
56 Total Number of Students Served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

<u>3</u> Autism	<u>2</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u> </u> Deafness	<u>5</u> Other Health Impaired
<u> </u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>29</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u> </u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>28</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u> </u> Hearing Impairment	<u> </u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>8</u> Mental Retardation	<u>4</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u> </u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>1</u> Emotional Disturbance

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

Number of Staff

	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>2</u>	<u> </u>
Classroom teachers	<u>35</u>	<u> </u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>7</u>	<u> </u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>13</u>	<u> </u>
Support staff	<u>5</u>	<u> </u>
Total number	<u>62</u>	<u> </u>

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio: 17.2

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. The student dropout rate is defined by the state. The student drop-off rate is the difference between the number of entering students and the number of exiting students from the same cohort. (From the same cohort, subtract the number of exiting students from the number of entering students; divide that number by the number of entering students; multiply by 100 to get the percentage drop-off rate.) Briefly explain in 100 words or fewer any major discrepancy between the dropout rate and the drop-off rate. (Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates and only high schools need to supply drop-off rates.)

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Daily student attendance	97%	97%	97%	97%	98%
*Daily teacher attendance	83%	77%	73%	79%	80%
Teacher turnover rate	2%	1%	6%	4%	6%
Student dropout rate (middle/high)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Student drop-off rate (high school)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

*attendance rate for teachers include all professional development workshops.

PART III – SUMMARY

Charles H. Mims Elementary School was built in 1985. Constructed to accommodate growth within the Mission School District, Mims has always been synonymous with excellence.

Through the years the population has fluctuated. The school demographics are comprised of 93.8% Hispanic, 5.8% White, 0.3% Black and 0.1% Asian. The Limited English population (LEP) is 18.9%, with economically disadvantaged currently at 53.2% and attendance rates at 98.1%, while the mobility rate is 5.6% . With statistical variance, success has been continuous.

Mims has had three principals. Hurla Midkiff, a long time successful educational leader, established the foundation of success for the school. Alicia Rios continued the formula, complementing existing programs with an innovative style. Our new principal, Joel Garcia, arrived (Spring of 2004) committed to keeping Mims exemplary. Reading has been the building block that has transcended instruction to complement all academic areas. Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction (ECRI) at the primary level develops modalities through structured vocabulary and comprehension development. Another component to our reading program is Reading Renaissance, a researched based, individualized guided reading practice program. Through teacher modeling, monitoring, and intervention, students proceed systematically within certification levels. Reading success and growth is experienced. All three principals have led Mims in achieving goals for academic success in balancing curriculum by including technology, physical and social development, and extra-curricular activities. Students are assisted and supported into the Mims model.

The Mims vision, “Determined to Blaze the Trails for Student Achievement” is adhered to daily. With its success, Mims adjusts to challenges that arise. Mims resembles a “magnet” school. Secondary honor classes are comprised primarily of former Mims students. Valedictorians and college scholarship recipients have been alumni. These results initially came from middle to upper middle class families. The same result is apparent today with more economically disadvantaged students and an influx of Mexican immigrants. With an enrollment as high as 1100 in 2003, a neighboring school was constructed easing our population. Losing staff and students, adjustments were made with Mims maintaining its standards. The new school has emulated Mims in its instructional approach honoring our first principal with the name-Midkiff Elementary.

The physical plant has changed as the population has fluctuated. The quality of student remains steady with facilities changing and improving. New students are indistinguishable from old students within months. With the technological curriculum based teaching methods and innovative techniques taking place, the Mims student is a constant. A well balanced student excelling in numerous activities mirrors the philosophy that believes in the dignity of the individual. The students are treated with respect so they are afforded the opportunity to develop intellectually, physically, and emotionally. It speaks to service, respect for person and tradition, character development, responsibilities of citizenship, and other attributes necessary for the making of a contributing member of society. School visitors remark about the ease of talking with Mims students. Their confidence and rapport is evident. The maturity and self discipline is apparent in their responsible demeanor throughout the school.

With the odds stacked against educating students, Mims is an oasis in a sea of educational uncertainty. The tradition of excellence continues because of the students and staff. With numerous honors in all areas, Mims continues to shine. It was named as one of two elementary campuses to be awarded the Texas Business and Education Coalition (TBEC) “Just for the Kids” award for five consecutive years. Mims Elementary provides all encompassing services for all students, including counseling, special education, speech therapy, at-risk tutoring, after school daycare, enhanced learning program activities, and athletic/intramural competition. All educational components coexist to provide an education with a style of learning that is known as the “Mims Way.”

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. School Assessment Results

The school accountability system in Texas plays a crucial role in determining how well public schools are performing. The statewide assessment program is comprised of Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) in the period 2000-2002, and the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) beginning in the year 2003, both of which are aligned with the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS). However, the change to TAKS in 2003 included testing in more grades and subjects, and is more challenging in content and format than the previous assessment. Schools are rated as exemplary, recognized, academically acceptable, or academically unacceptable based upon the performance of students and attendance rates. Performance of special education students on the State-Developed Alternative Assessment (SDAA) is also included in the school's rating. In addition, new passing standards were phased in over a three year period for grades 3 through 11. For example, in 2003, the third grade passing standard for the reading test was at 56%. In 2004, the passing standard was increased to 61%, and in 2005, it will increase to 67%. To further increase the stakes, passing these tests is required for promotion in some grades. (State guidelines available at www.tea.state.tx.us)

Mims Elementary has received "exemplary" ratings for seven consecutive years up to the year 2003. An exemplary rating, the highest rating, requires at least 90% of the students tested to pass in every subject. Based on our assessment results, Mims has consistently maintained its high ratings above the state and district averages. The last year of TAAS in 2002, 96.3% of the sum of our students met the standard in the area of reading, as compared to the state of 91.3%. In the area of writing, 100% met the standard, whereas the state was 88.7%. In math, 97.8% met the standard, above the state at 92.7%. The following year was the transition to the new TAKS standard, and Texas schools carried over the previous year's rating. In 2004, Mims maintained scores well above 90% with the new criteria in the areas of reading (95%), math (95%), and writing (99%). Due to rigorous state demands, science was included in the criteria for the school's rating, and 82% of the students met this passing requirement as compared to the state with 70%; thus, resulting in a "recognized" rating for our campus. Based on assessment results accumulated during an eight year period, the Texas Business and Educators Coalition (TBEC) "Just for the Kids" has recognized Mims with prestigious awards. Our school is one out of two schools, in the state of Texas, to receive this accolade for five consecutive years. Due to the students' achievements, our campus has also been featured in *Texas Monthly* (November 2001) as one of the top schools in Texas.

Mims has been able to pave a path of success for all its students, including all subgroups. Our school is part of a district in which 84.4% of the student population is economically disadvantaged, and where we have experienced an influx of second language learners. Our Hispanic population continues academic equity amongst all subgroups. Furthermore, special education students performed well at 93% on the SDAA assessments in 2004. It is also important to mention that Mims was able to retain its focus on instruction for our students despite the sudden loss of our principal, Alicia Rios, in January of 2004. Our administrators, teachers, staff, and parents are committed in continuing the tradition of excellence for our students while cultivating our school's mission.

2. Monitoring and Use of Assessment Data

Desegregation of assessment data is an integral component of our success. This endeavor is a spiraling effort which is multi-faceted. Mission CISD provides every school with district benchmarks. The district utilizes Test Mate to disaggregate data and provide reports to campus administrators and teachers. The reports include a building item report and an objective report which are reviewed and discussed during grade level meetings. A plan of action is prepared to address weaknesses.

Content area coordinators provide campuses with assessment results by teacher, campus, and district. These reports are utilized to target students who did not perform well. Administrators then meet with individual teachers to discuss strategy implementation for student improvement. Knowing how other schools are performing provides us with healthy competition. Our district assessments give us a preview on how our students will perform on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), thus the results are disaggregated by class and student.

Our vertical alignment team meets on the first week of each six weeks to bridge the gaps between grade levels. Benchmark results are again used to determine which Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) need to be addressed vertically. Presentations on teaching techniques and strategies are offered by teachers to focus on weaknesses and enrichment.

Progress report card night is fundamental as a means to communicate assessment data to parents. Our progress report card night is held on the third week of each six weeks to present parents assessment data. In turn, our parents are expected to sit with their children to work on weaknesses utilizing the TAKS Study Guide that is provided to students who are at-risk. Reading Renaissance STARtest, Texas Primary Reading Inventory (TPRI), Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction (ECRI), and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) provide meaningful feedback, diagnosis, and intervention.

Assessment data is an intricate part for each classroom teacher in evaluating and justifying progress for each and every student. The basis for student progress is determined daily with all phases of testing and individual assignments. The reports are a determining factor on both the weak and strong points in the instruction for student success.

3. Communicating Student Performance

Establishing an effective communication process between teachers, students, parents, and the community is instrumental in the overall success of educating our Mims students. Parents are notified about their child's performance during progress report night held every six weeks, report cards, and letters with detailed results of state and local benchmark assessments. Individual conferences may also be scheduled with teachers and administrators. Our campus report card is accessible via the internet on the Texas Education Agency website. Students are provided with a homework planner in each grade level so that parents may review and sign daily assignments. The campus liaison is available for home visits and provides parents with workshops and resources with emphasis on maintaining open lines of communication for student success.

Performance is also rewarded with proper recognition of students and parents. At Mims, the recognition of both the child and the parents are presented in a light that expectations for commended performance and exceptional work is a requirement. Thus, these types of assemblies and community presentations are essential to fulfill the needs of all students, parents, and all involved in the education of our students.

A contributing member of education in the local community, Dr. Charles H. Mims personified the attributes of personal dignity, respect, and character development. A pioneer in the field of medicine and education, as well as a philanthropist, his beliefs speak to service. A champion for the population of Mission, he instilled the foundations for equal health care and educational opportunity as he served in the capacities of local doctor and school board member. The "Mims Way" is exemplified by a learning environment that is fostered by ideals based on expectations of success.

4. Sharing Success With Other Schools

In keeping with the district model, "Success for Every Student," Mims is very proud of our students and gladly shares methodology, strategies, practices, and curriculum. Sharing begins within our campus and extends to cover our district, region, state, and national level. Blazing the trail through training has guided the path for best practices and leadership.

Within our campus, sharing begins with meetings: grade level, vertical, horizontal, technology

mini –lessons, and staff development. New teachers have mentors to guide them to reach the success that is expected at Mims. We have mentored new principals, instructional supervisors, and teachers, who in turn have used several or all programs utilized at Mims.

Mims has been the leader in our district, and our doors are always open for visits and the opportunity to have a question /answer forum. We have hosted numerous visits from surrounding campuses and districts throughout the state. They observe and question our methods in academics, ECRI, technology, and Reading Renaissance. Mims has been invited to present our practices with other educators at events such as district in services, Region 1 Service Center trainings, and TBEC.

We have had the opportunity to meet many educators from across the state and nation while attending conferences. The staff's recognition as a member of our school is the evidence of our contribution in providing strategies and knowledge base for other schools. We have and will continue to accommodate every request to share. We are humbled by their visits and always strive to uphold the excellence and tradition at Mims Elementary.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. The School's Curriculum

Mims Elementary curriculum components are found in each subject and we utilize the programs and resources provided by the school and the district. Each subject area is carefully monitored with assessments and teacher input. The foundation of our curriculum lies on the lower grade levels. Basic spelling, pronunciation, addition, and subtraction facts are emphasized and build on to the upper grade levels. The Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills are the outlines, but the perimeters of learning are pushed to their limits by staff and student.

Our reading program uses Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction and the Reading Renaissance Program in conjunction with the Accelerated Reader program for instructional and monitoring purposes. The emphasis on reading produces over 15,000 plus books in circulation through our library in a six weeks period. Furthermore, the majority of students read at or up to two and a half years above grade level. Accountability for students meeting their goals is checked weekly. ECRI promotes reading and develops young readers at the levels of Pre-Kinder to 2nd grade. This timed program is based on a focused instruction delivery with emphasis on spelling, pronunciation, and vocabulary usage.

Math is taught incrementally from year to year. The curriculum contains Accelerated Math, and Excel Math that reinforces concepts and problem solving. Teaching the TEKS with the use of math manipulatives, computer-based programs, and computer assisted instruction (CAI) enhance the daily production of work. With requirements by the state rising every year, our program is quickly adjusting to high-order thinking skills and the use of Bloom's Taxonomy questioning techniques.

Science and Social Studies utilize topic maps and timelines based on the objectives. Science has recently become part of the accountability system. With science, lab activities and scientific process type of lessons have been implemented. The campus has placed all science materials in one lab setting for the entire campus to prepare science laboratory experiments.

Physical Education and Music enhance the instruction inside the classroom by focusing on healthy bodies and developing articulate and well-rounded students in the arts. Both classes are responsible for presenting our students in a different light that allows the student to surpass the goals academically, physically, and emotionally.

Other programs that enhance the curriculum are the gifted and talented Program, U.I.L., and resource labs. They systematically contribute to all concepts for student recollection and mastery. These types of pull out or after school programs keep the trail of success at its maximum and success at the students' reach.

2a. Reading Curriculum

Our reading curriculum begins with a research-based foundation, implementing the ECRI program in Pre-Kinder to 2nd. ECRI is a systematic approach, incorporating multiple learning styles. Students use all modalities in acquiring phonemic skills and become confident vocabulary decoders.

We believe that vocabulary acquisition facilitates fluency and enables students to master literal and critical comprehension strategies that continue to promote successful reading in all subjects in each respective grade. All grade levels utilize the McMillan/McGraw Hill state adopted basal reading program. Authentic literature stimulates student interest to master the state mandated reading objectives. The staff utilizes commercial materials to foster necessary skills in building well balanced readers.

Reading timelines provided by the district language arts coordinator guide teacher instruction assuring a solid vertical foundation of literacy skills. Student mastery of timeline objectives are assessed every week. The staff reviews reports allowing individual needs to be addressed, as well as classroom strengths and weaknesses. Grade level personnel focus on student mastery to generate action plans. We implement a cooperative approach to instruction in that we believe in the success of each child.

“Today a Reader, Tomorrow a Leader,” compels us in supporting classroom instruction with a minimum of 30 minutes daily guided reading practice. The techniques and practices are based on the Reading Renaissance Program. We hold the belief that to be a good reader a child must practice reading at his/her own individual reading level and experience success. Student reading levels are identified within their zone of proximal development through the STAR reading program. Library books are labeled with corresponding reading levels ensuring student selection of materials that will encourage and promote growth.

3. P.E. Curriculum

The physical education curriculum of Charles H. Mims Elementary School is based on the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) and supplemented by Mission Consolidated Independent School District’s Coordinated Approach to Child Health (CATCH) program. The school’s high incidence of Acanthosis Nigricans (ANTES) the type II diabetes visual marking indicating insulin resistance, necessitates added instruction. Students are educated in preventive measures by improving lifestyle management. Each respective grade level masters state essential elements while adhering to national standards based on the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE). The CATCH program aligns physical, nutritional, and health classroom instruction. In a cooperative effort the physical education instructor, cafeteria manager, and classroom teachers reinforce the curriculum content. Diabetes prevention education is correlated with health screenings, at-risk education, parent liaison contacts, and fund-raising efforts associated with American Diabetes Association (ADA).

With academic success prevalent at Mims, physical education also assists in compliance with the school’s mission, “Determined to Blaze the Trails for Student Achievement”. Activities that develop and refine patterns of movement in three areas are locomotion, manipulation, and non-locomotion which are in place at the primary, intermediate, and advanced levels. Success is recognized through mastery of basic motor skills, complicated athletic movements, and neuromuscular skill development. Fitness assessment takes place yearly with the President’s Challenge Fitness Test. The students are made aware of specific fitness components and strive to improve their individual health. The children are recognized with monthly, six week, and yearly achievements. The awards are for fitness, athletic, and personal endeavors. Success takes place on a daily basis with skills strengthened that carry over to academic and life benefits. Responsibility, determination, effort, cooperation, and honor are words that students learn through action. Their achievements indicate awareness and adherence to a mission that permeates through the school.

4. Instructional Methods

Mims instruction centers on expectations that teaching to the “high-level” student enhances the education for the entire class. The Enhance Learning Program (ELP) principles are practiced on a daily basis for Gifted and Talented students. This program is implemented by a single teacher that cradles the population at the lower grade levels with high order thinking skills, project-based instruction, technology implementation, curriculum related field trips, and hands on multi-tasking teaming among the students, while the newly certified gifted and talented teachers serve upper grade levels. The ELP program facilitates peer tutoring for every other subgroup in the grade levels. Initial screening for participation has now been modified in the district within the past year, due to complaints that Mims had over 15% of population as Gifted and Talented instead of the state required 5%. After the district wide testing of over 800 students for this program, Mims was able to qualify 108 students. This testing fortified the notion that Mims Elementary is considered the “magnet school.” Staff, students, and parents acknowledged the fact that the student outcomes for our campus are primarily based on expectations, assessment, strategies and positive feedback for student success. The excellence continues with providing the best education situations for, not only our ELP students, but everyone that enters the doors at Mims Elementary.

In connection to the learning of all students towards the high end of the instructional spectrum, our school’s ventures in methods are also proven in our University Interscholastic League (UIL) participation. UIL is utilized as academic competition in our district for the areas of number sense, science, and literary events to name a few. Mims succeeds in most and takes the competition to areas around the state. The challenge is met by competing with other elementary and middle school students. Mims is recognized throughout the state for taking 1st- 5th place in several events. Again, Mims is the trailblazer.

5. The School’s Professional Development

Continuous implementation of programs from the state and district level has depleted resources on the economic side of instruction. Mims Elementary builds on current and old programs by providing professional development at the pace of the teacher’s requirements. The Site-Based Decision Making Committee utilizes its position to promote the needed curriculum materials and in services for maintaining student outcomes on the exemplary side. Region 1 Service Center, local conventions or presentations, and state conventions are available for teachers to address the areas of the current and future programs. Administration is well aware that fostering this type of open door policy can better service the needs of the students. Technology is an intricate part of success in this modern age of instruction. The current and latest in services have been guided for such things as: united streaming, video connections, internet use and/or use of computer projectors, and document viewers for an outstanding environment in the classroom. Current staff members are capable and have been utilized to present on programs, subject areas, and strategies at the campus, district, and regional level. Relying on the 12.5 average years of experience for the staff, all staff members use their expertise to cooperate with one another. Continuous checks and balances in each grade level allow for creativity and cohesive planning.

Just as the continuous success of the campus is evident, the staff is consistent in providing professional development for each other throughout the year. Frequent department and grade level meetings, planning sessions, vertical alignment, and brain storming fulfill the requirements in complementing the existing programs. Teachers seek other components and are able to make recommendations on purchasing and utilizing new programs.

Grade Kinder Test Terra Nova

Publisher CTB McGraw-Hill

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores ____ Percentiles ____

	2000-2001	1999-2000	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April	April	April	April
Publication Year	2001	1997	2001	1997
SCHOOL SCORES	Math	Math	Reading	Reading
Total Score	85	93	78	88
Number of students tested	100	88	100	88
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES				

*Terra Nova scores are not disaggregated for ethnic/racial or socioeconomic groups

	2000-2001	1999-2000	2000-2001	1999-2000
	Math	Math	Reading	Reading
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE	65	76	65	74
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION	7	7	7	7

Grade 1st Test Terra Nova

Publisher CTB McGraw-Hill

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores ____ Percentiles ____

	2000-2001	1999-2000	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April	April	April	April
Publication Year	2001	1997	2001	1997
SCHOOL SCORES	Math	Math	Reading	Reading
Total Score	78	85	79	91
Number of students tested	101	108	101	108
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES				

*Terra Nova scores are not disaggregated for ethnic/racial or socioeconomic groups

	2000-2001	1999-2000	2000-2001	1999-2000
	Math	Math	Reading	Reading
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE	66	71	67	75
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION	7	7	7	7

Grade 2nd Test Terra Nova

Publisher CTB McGraw-Hill

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores ____ Percentiles ____

	2000-2001	1999-2000	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April	April	April	April
Publication Year	2001	1997	2001	1997
SCHOOL SCORES	Math	Math	Reading	Reading
Total Score	73	77	68	71
Number of students tested	125	85	125	85
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES				

*Terra Nova scores are not disaggregated for ethnic/racial or socioeconomic groups

	2000-2001	1999-2000	2000-2001	1999-2000
	Math	Math	Reading	Reading
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE	61	65	57	61
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION	6	6	6	6

Grade Kinder Test Iowa Tests of Basic Skills

Publisher Riverside Publishing Company

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores ____ Percentiles ____

	2003-2004	2003-2004
Testing month	April	April
Publication Year	2002	2002
SCHOOL SCORES	Math	Reading
Total Score	67	52
Number of students tested	99	99
Percent of total students tested	96%	95%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES		

*Terra Nova scores are not disaggregated for ethnic/racial or socioeconomic groups

	2003-2004	2003-2004
	Math	Reading
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE	79	55
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION	7	5

Grade 1st Test Iowa Tests of Basic Skills

Publisher Riverside Publishing Company

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores ____ Percentiles ____

	2003-2004	2003-2004
Testing month	April	April
Publication Year	2002	2002
SCHOOL SCORES	Math	Reading
Total Score	69	70
Number of students tested	91	91
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	2	2
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES		

*Terra Nova scores are not disaggregated for ethnic/racial or socioeconomic groups

	2003-2004	2003-2004
	Math	Reading
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE	82	83
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION	7	7

Grade 2nd Test Iowa Tests of Basic Skills

Publisher Riverside Publishing Company

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores ____ Percentiles ____

	2003-2004	2003-2004
Testing month	April	April
Publication Year	2002	2002
SCHOOL SCORES	Math	Reading
Total Score	61	60
Number of students tested	80	80
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	2	2
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1%	1%
SUBGROUP SCORES		

*Terra Nova scores are not disaggregated for ethnic/racial or socioeconomic groups

	2003-2004	2003-2004
	Math	Reading
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE	69	68
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION	6	6

Texas Tests

Texas Assessment of Academic Skills(2000-2002)

Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills(2003-2004)

Grade 3rd

Subject Reading

	TAKS 2003-2004	TAKS 2002-2003	TAAS 2001-2002	TAAS 2000-2001	TAAS 1999-2000
Testing month	June	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	94%	96%	98%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	95%	94%	-	-	-
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	49%	35%	-	-	-
% Mastered All Objectives (TAAS)	-	-	75%	68%	60%
Number of students tested	81	113	121	88	93
Percent of total students tested	90%	97%	90%	95%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	3	3	2	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	90%	87%	92%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	90%	92%	-	-	-
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	60%	26%	-	-	-
Number of Students Tested	41	54	69	52	61
2. Hispanic					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	94%	96%	99%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	95%	93%	-	-	-
% Commended Performance (TAKS)		32%	-	-	-
Number of Students Tested	81	104	116	91	91
STATE SCORES					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	N/A	N/A	87%	86%	87%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	91%	89%	N/A	N/A	N/A
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	35%	26%	N/A	N/A	N/A

Met Standard = Meeting state minimum passage of 70% of objectives answered correctly.

Commended Performance = Meeting 100% of all objectives. Subgroups not available on state scores and campus scores when less than five students are tested.

Below Standard = Vendor does not report these numbers.

State Mean Score – State Mean Scores not reported by test vendor.

N/A = Not Available

+= The minimum amount of students needed for group assessment was not met.

- = Not Applicable

Texas Tests

Texas Assessment of Academic Skills(2000-2002)

Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills(2003-2004)

Grade 3rd

Subject Math

	TAKS 2003-2004	TAKS 2002-2003	TAAS 2001-2002	TAAS 2000-2001	TAAS 1999-2000
Testing month	April	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	95.2%	97%	96%
%Met Standard (TAKS)	96%	99%	-	-	-
%Commended Performance (TAKS)	40%	31%	-	-	-
%Mastered All Objectives (TAAS)	-	-	30%	39%	35%
Number of students tested	81	114	121	84	94
Percent of total students tested	96%	98%	90%	88%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	2	3	2	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1%	2%	3%	2%	1%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	91%	96%	97%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	95%	98%	-	-	-
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	24%	32%	-	-	-
Number of Students Tested	41	56	69	53	66
2. Hispanic					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	94%	98%	96%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	96%	99%	-	-	-
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	40%	27%	-	-	-
Number of Students Tested	81	104	116	94	92
STATE SCORES					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	N/A	N/A	87%	82%	80%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	90%	90%	N/A	N/A	N/A
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	25%	18%	N/A	N/A	N/A

Met Standard = Meeting state minimum passage of 70% of objectives answered correctly.

Commended Performance = Meeting 100% of all objectives. Subgroups not available on state scores and campus scores when less than five students are tested.

Below Standard = Vendor does not report these numbers.

State Mean Score – State Mean Scores not reported by test vendor.

N/A = Not Available

+= The minimum amount of students needed for group assessment was not met.

- = Not Applicable

Texas Tests
Texas Assessment of Academic Skills(2000-2002)
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills(2003-2004)
Grade 4th Subject Reading

	TAKS 2003-2004	TAKS 2002-2003	TAAS 2001-2002	TAAS 2000-2001	TAAS 1999-2000
Testing month	April	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	98%	96%	97%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	94%	92%	-	-	-
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	30%	24%	-	-	-
% Mastered All Objectives (TAAS)	-	-	63%	60%	68%
Number of students tested	83	135	101	110	97
Percent of total students tested	94%	94%	97%	97%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	9	3	2	4
Percent of students alternatively assessed	-	6%	2%	2%	4%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	97%	92%	93%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	92%	91%	-	-	-
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	24%	16%	-	-	-
Number of Students Tested	38	58	66	66	45
2. Hispanic					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	98%	94%	96%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	93%	92%	-	-	-
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	26%	33%	-	-	-
Number of Students Tested	74	124	97	109	92
STATE SCORES					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	N/A	N/A	92%	90%	89%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	85%	85%	N/A	N/A	N/A
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	25%	17%	N/A	N/A	N/A

Met Standard = Meeting state minimum passage of 70% of objectives answered correctly.

Commended Performance = Meeting 100% of all objectives. Subgroups not available on state scores and campus scores when less than five students are tested.

Below Standard = Vendor does not report these numbers.

State Mean Score – State Mean Scores not reported by test vendor.

N/A = Not Available

+= The minimum amount of students needed for group assessment was not met.

- = Not Applicable

Texas Tests
Texas Assessment of Academic Skills(2000-2002)
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills(2003-2004)
Grade 4th Subject Math

	TAKS 2003-2004	TAKS 2002-2003	TAAS 2001-2002	TAAS 2000-2001	TAAS 1999-2000
Testing month	April	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	97%	99%	97%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	98%	96%	-	-	-
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	43%	16%	-	-	-
% Mastered All Objectives (TAAS)	-	-	35%	15%	40%
Number of students tested	83	135	102	114	90
Percent of total students tested	98%	93%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	9	0	3	4
Percent of students alternatively assessed	-	7%	-	3%	4%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	97%	99%	96%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	95%	97%	-	-	-
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	32%	9%	-	-	-
Number of Students Tested	38	58	66	68	45
2. Hispanic					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	97%	96%	96%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	97%	96%	-	-	-
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	42%	15%	-	-	-
Number of Students Tested	74	124	97	111	83
STATE SCORES					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	N/A	N/A	94%	91%	87%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	86%	87%	N/A	N/A	N/A
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	21%	15%	N/A	N/A	N/A

Met Standard = Meeting state minimum passage of 70% of objectives answered correctly.

Commended Performance = Meeting 100% of all objectives. Subgroups not available on state scores and campus scores when less than five students are tested.

Below Standard = Vendor does not report these numbers.

State Mean Score – State Mean Scores not reported by test vendor.

N/A = Not Available

+= The minimum amount of students needed for group assessment was not met.

- = Not Applicable

Texas Tests
Texas Assessment of Academic Skills(2000-2002)
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills(2003-2004)
Grade 5th Subject Reading

	TAKS 2003-2004	TAKS 2002-2003	TAAS 2001-2002	TAAS 2000-2001	TAAS 1999-2000
Testing month	April	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	96%	95%	96%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	90%	88%	-	-	-
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	31%	28%	-	-	-
% Mastered All Objectives (TAAS)	-	-	49%	69%	
Number of students tested	87	116	120	110	79
Percent of total students tested	90%	98%	93%	99%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	6	3	1	1	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	6%	2%	1%	1%	1%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	95%	92%	93%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	92%	90%	-	-	-
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	14%	25%	-	-	-
Number of Students Tested	36	69	73	63	43
2. Hispanic					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	96%	95%	97%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	88%	92%	-	-	-
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	31%	27%	-	-	-
Number of Students Tested	78	106	94	102	65
STATE SCORES					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	N/A	N/A	92%	90%	87%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	79%	79%	N/A	N/A	N/A
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	25%	17%	N/A	N/A	N/A

Met Standard = Meeting state minimum passage of 70% of objectives answered correctly.

Commended Performance = Meeting 100% of all objectives. Subgroups not available on state scores and campus scores when less than five students are tested.

Below Standard = Vendor does not report these numbers.

State Mean Score – State Mean Scores not reported by test vendor.

N/A = Not Available

+= The minimum amount of students needed for group assessment was not met.

- = Not Applicable

Texas Tests
Texas Assessment of Academic Skills(2000-2002)
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills(2003-2004)
Grade 5th Subject Math

	TAKS 2003-2004	TAKS 2002-2003	TAAS 2001-2002	TAAS 2000-2001	TAAS 1999-2000
Testing month	April	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	100%	99%	100%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	91%	92%	-	-	-
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	38%	20%	-	-	-
% Mastered All Objectives (TAAS)	-	-	49%	34%	33%
Number of students tested	87	118	120	108	79
Percent of total students tested	95%	98%	96%	98%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	4	5	0	1	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	5%	5%	-	1%	1%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	100%	97%	100%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	86%	89%	-	-	-
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	31%	12%	-	-	-
Number of Students Tested	36	74	73	62	43
2. Hispanic					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	100%	98%	100%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	91%	93%	-	-	-
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	40%	18%	-	-	-
Number of Students Tested	78	110	94	101	65
STATE SCORES					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	N/A	N/A	96%	94%	92%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	82%	86%	N/A	N/A	N/A
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	26%	17%	N/A	N/A	N/A

Met Standard = Meeting state minimum passage of 70% of objectives answered correctly.

Commended Performance = Meeting 100% of all objectives. Subgroups not available on state scores and campus scores when less than five students are tested.

Below Standard = Vendor does not report these numbers.

State Mean Score – State Mean Scores not reported by test vendor.

N/A = Not Available

+= The minimum amount of students needed for group assessment was not met.

- = Not Applicable

Texas Tests
Texas Assessment of Academic Skills(2000-2002)
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills(2003-2004)
Grade 6th Subject Reading

	TAKS 2003-2004	TAKS 2002-2003	TAAS 2001-2002	TAAS 2000-2001	TAAS 1999-2000
Testing month	April	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	98%	98%	95%
%Met Standard (TAKS)	99%	94%	-	-	-
%Commended Performance (TAKS)	49%	40%	-	-	-
%Mastered All Objectives (TAAS)	-	-	40%	70%	51%
Number of students tested	80	129	111	82	101
Percent of total students tested	92%	97%	97%	98%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	3	0	0	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1%	2%	-	-	1%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	97%	96%	92%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	99%	91%	-	-	-
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	44%	38%	-	-	-
Number of Students Tested	52	77	68	46	52
2. Hispanic					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	98%	97%	94.7%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	100%	94%	-	-	-
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	47%	39%	-	-	-
Number of Students Tested	74	124	104	69	94
STATE SCORES					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	N/A	N/A	88%	85%	86%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	86%	86%	N/A	N/A	N/A
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	28%	25%	N/A	N/A	N/A

Met Standard = Meeting state minimum passage of 70% of objectives answered correctly.

Commended Performance = Meeting 100% of all objectives. Subgroups not available on state scores and campus scores when less than five students are tested.

Below Standard = Vendor does not report these numbers.

State Mean Score – State Mean Scores not reported by test vendor.

N/A = Not Available

+= The minimum amount of students needed for group assessment was not met.

- = Not Applicable

Texas Tests
Texas Assessment of Academic Skills(2000-2002)
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills(2003-2004)
Grade 6th Subject Math

	TAKS 2003-2004	TAKS 2002-2003	TAAS 2001-2002	TAAS 2000-2001	TAAS 1999-2000
Testing month	April	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	99%	100%	97%
%Met Standard (TAKS)	95%	85%	-	-	-
%Commended Performance (TAKS)	44%	30%	-	-	-
%Mastered All Objectives (TAAS)	-	-		100%	
Number of students tested	81	130	111	82	102
Percent of total students tested	93%	98%	97%	98%	98%
Number of students alternatively assessed	2	2	0	1	2
Percent of students alternatively assessed	2%	2%	-	1%	2%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	98%	100%	96%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	92%	82%	-	-	-
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	43%	24%	-	-	-
Number of Students Tested	53	78	68	45	53
2. Hispanic					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	-	-	99%	100%	97%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	95%	85%	-	-	-
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	44%	29%	-	-	-
Number of Students Tested	75	125	104	69	95
STATE SCORES					
% Met Minimum Standards (TAAS)	N/A	N/A	93%	91%	88%
% Met Standard (TAKS)	77%	79%	N/A	N/A	N/A
% Commended Performance (TAKS)	22%	16%	N/A	N/A	N/A

Met Standard = Meeting state minimum passage of 70% of objectives answered correctly.

Commended Performance = Meeting 100% of all objectives. Subgroups not available on state scores and campus scores when less than five students are tested.

Below Standard = Vendor does not report these numbers.

State Mean Score – State Mean Scores not reported by test vendor.

N/A = Not Available

+= The minimum amount of students needed for group assessment was not met.

- = Not Applicable